



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/590,140

09/28/2006

Dominique Michel

LP-2019

5645

217 7590 07/30/2009

FISHER, CHRISTEN & SABOL

1120 20TH STREET, NW, SOUTH TOWER, SUITE 750

WASHINGTON, DC 20036

EXAMINER

SOLOLA, TAOFIQ A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1625

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

07/30/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/590,140	Applicant(s) MICHEL ET AL.	
	Examiner Taofiq A. Solola	Art Unit 1625	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 June 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 8-10 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 and 11-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>10/18/06</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 1625

Claims 1-18 are pending in this application.

Claims 8-10 are drawn to non-elected inventions.

Restriction Requirement

The election of group I, claims 1-7, 11-15, with traverse in the Paper filed 6/1/09, is hereby acknowledged. However, no reason is given for the traversal. Therefore, the restriction is deemed proper and made FINAL.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-7, 11-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Staszak et al., EP 0 457 559 A2, in view of Sakaraba et al., Chem. Pharm. Bull., Vol 43(5), (1995), pages 748-753; Okeda et al., EP 0 955 303 A2, and Antognazza et al., US 5,907,045.

Applicant claims a process of making compounds of formulae Ia and Ib comprising hydrogenation of a salt of formula II, which is formed by reacting formula II with a carboxylic acid. The hydrogenation is performed in the presence of a complex comprising a transition metal and a disphosphine ligand as a catalyst.

Determination of the scope and content of the prior art (MPEP 2141.01)

Staszak et al., teach similar process using HCl acid in the first step. Staszak et al., also teach that carboxylic acids are applicable. See page 5, lines 2-7.

Ascertainment of the difference between the prior art and the claims (MPEP 2141.02)

The difference between the instant invention and that of the prior art is that the prior art use LAH as the catalyst instead of a complex comprising a transition metal and a disphosphine ligand.

Art Unit: 1625

Finding of prima facie obviousness---rational and motivation (MPEP 2142.2413)

However, the remaining prior arts listed above teach catalysts comprising various disphosphine ligands and transition metals in enantioselective hydrogenation process of similar compounds. See pages 748-750 of Sakaraba et al., pages 1-24 of Okeda et al., and the abstract and col. 1-8 of Antognazza et al.

Therefore, the instant invention is prima facie obvious from the teachings of the prior arts. One of ordinary skill in the art would have known to use a complex comprising a transition metal and a disphosphine ligand in any enantioselective hydrogenation process at the time this invention was made. The choice of a specific disphosphine ligand and/or specific transition metal is an obvious modification available for the preference of an artisan. The motivation is from knowing that disphosphine ligands and transition metals are useful as enantioselective hydrogenation catalysts.

Telephone Inquiry

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Taofiq A. Solola, PhD. JD., whose telephone number is (571) 272-0709.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Janet Andres, can be reached on (571) 272-0867. The fax phone number for this Group is (571) 273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-1600.

/Taofiq A. Solola/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1625

July 28, 2009

